

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 8 and 11-16 are all the claims pending in the application. In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter.

**I. Overview of the Office Action**

Claims 1-6, 8, and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1-6, 8, and 11-16 are rejected on the ground of non statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of Takahashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,462,905, hereafter “Takahashi”) in view of Laverriere (European Patent Application No. 1284687).. Claims 1-6, 8, and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of Laverriere. Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejections.

**II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner alleges that claims 1-6, 8, and 11-16 are indefinite because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the peripheral surface side of the reel hub”, as recited in lines 21-22 of claim 1; lines 11-12 of claim 11, and lines 16-17 of claim 14. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, and 14 in order to improve clarity. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to remove the § 112 rejection.

**III. Double Patenting Rejection.**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 8, and 11-16 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of Laverriere.

Along with this Amendment, Applicant is submitting a terminal disclaimer with regard to Takahashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,462,905, hereafter "Takahashi"). Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to withdraw the double patenting rejections.

**IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner alleges that Takahashi discloses all of the features of independent claim 1 and analogous independent claims 11 and 14 except for the feature "wherein the taper wall is provided unitarily with the plurality of projections at an inner peripheral surface side of the reel hub, and is radially aligned with the gear teeth". The Examiner thus relies on Laverriere to allegedly cure this deficiency, and contends that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Takahashi and Laverriere "in order to facilitate forming the gear teeth and taper walls".<sup>2</sup>

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position. There is no teaching or suggestion in Laverriere of (nor does the Examiner provide specific support in the cited reference for) this feature of the claim. In fact, it is unclear how the Examiner reads the claimed "gear teeth" on the teachings of Laverriere. Laverriere appears to teach that a projection means 70 is angled towards the wall of the hub (column 4, lines 28-36). However, Laverriere does not disclose where gear teeth may be located.

Moreover, in the present case, the Examiner has not provided any supportable objective reasoning how or why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Takahashi in view of Laverriere, since the cited references use diverse braking units.

The Examiner contends that a projection 70 of Laverriere corresponds to the taper wall recited in claim 1 of the claimed invention, and that the gear teeth are also disclosed in

---

<sup>2</sup> Page 5 of the Office Action dated November 6, 2007.

Laverriere. Referring to Fig. 5 of Laverriere, ring-shaped teeth are shown adjacent to the projection 70 including an inclined abutting surface 72.

However, even if the ring-shaped teeth in Fig. 5 of Laverriere are the element which the Examiner considers as the gear teeth, these are clearly different from the gear teeth 72A, as recited in claim 1 and shown in Fig. 9 of the instant invention. In the instant invention, the gear teeth 72A are provided on the projection 72 itself. Thus, Laverriere does not disclose the feature "the gear teeth are provided at distal ends of the plurality of projections", as recited in claim 1.

Independent claims 1, 11, and 14 have been amended to read that "providing the gear teeth on distal end portions of the plurality of projections:. This feature is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 14 should be allowable because the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the features of the claims. Claims 2-6, 8, 12, 13, 15, and 16 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1, 11, and 14.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Mark E. Wallerson  
Registration No. 59,043

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 6, 2008